

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

RONALD GARREN,

Plaintiff,

v.

JAMES DZURENDA, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:23-cv-00141-MMD-CSD

ORDER

*Pro se* Plaintiff Ronald Garren sued prison officials under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 as well as the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (“RLUIPA”) for allegedly interfering with his ability to participate in sweat lodge ceremonies. (ECF Nos. 10, 11.) Before the Court is United States Magistrate Judge Craig S. Denney’s Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 23 (“R&R”)), recommending that the Court deny Plaintiff’s request for injunctive relief (ECF Nos. 4,5). Objections to the R&R were due February 13, 2024. (See *id.*) To date, no objections to the R&R have been filed. For this reason, and as further explained below, the Court adopts the R&R in full.

Because there was no objection, the Court need not conduct *de novo* review, and is satisfied that Judge Denney did not clearly err. See *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1116 (9th Cir. 2003) (“De novo review of the magistrate judges’ findings and recommendations is required if, but *only* if, one or both parties file objections to the findings and recommendations.”) (emphasis in original). Judge Denney recommends denying Plaintiff’s request for injunctive relief primarily because he has not shown he is likely to prevail on his claim that Defendants are impermissibly burdening his rights under RLUIPA because they are only giving him monthly—instead of weekly—access to the sweat lodge. (ECF No. 23 at 7-9.) Judge Denney did not clearly err.

///

1 It is therefore ordered that the Report and Recommendation of United States  
2 Magistrate Judge Craig S. Denney (ECF No. 23) is accepted and adopted in full.

3 It is further that Plaintiff's motions seeking injunctive relief (ECF Nos. 4, 5) are  
4 denied.

5 DATED THIS 20<sup>th</sup> Day of February 2024.

6  
7 

8  
9 

---

MIRANDA M. DU  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE